

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### **Attendees, Date and Type of Interview**

A personal interview was conducted on November 9, 2010 and attended by Examiner Paul S. Hyun, Supervisory Patent Examiner In Suk Bullock, Dr. John Murphy and Jerry L. Hefner.

### **Identification of Claims Discussed**

Independent claims 1, 9, 39 were discussed. Additionally, dependent claims 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 48, 49 and 51 were discussed.

### **Identification of Prior Art Discussed**

The references Balch (US 6,083,763), Van Brunt (US 2004/0067164), Hartwich (WO 01/69210), and Davies (US 2003/0143591) were discussed.

### **Principal Arguments and Other Matters**

The rejections cited in the Office action issued June 24, 2010 were discussed. With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, Applicants argued that the specification provides support for the amendment introduced to Claims 30, 31, 35, 36, 48 and 49. With respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, Applicant provided reasons why none of the cited combinations of art renders any of the rejected claims obvious.

### **Results of Interview**

The Examiner acknowledged that the specification provides support for dependent claims 30, 31, 35, 36, 48 and 49. Applicants agreed to clarify claims 33, 38 and 51. The Examiner agreed to consider applicants' written arguments regarding the non-obviousness of the claims rejected in the Office Action issued June 24, 2010.